

THE SUNDAY GLOBE.

OFFICE OF PUBLICATION:
407 ELEVENTH STREET NORTHWEST.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.
Per annum (in advance)..... \$2.00
Single copies..... 5 cents
For sale at all the city news stands and
by the newsboys.

SUNDAY GLOBE PUBLISHING CO.
W. J. ELLIOTT, EDITOR.
GEO. F. HAYES, MANAGER.

NOTICE TO ADVERTISERS.

Rates of advertising will be made known at the office or by The Sunday Globe's accredited agent. The Sunday Globe is an exclusive local publication and will be found a valuable medium to reach the patronage of the Washington public.

SUNDAY, MAY 5, 1901.

SALUTATORY.

With this, the initial issue of the Washington Sunday Morning Globe, the undersigned salutes the reading public of the Capital City of the Nation. The Sunday Morning Globe is designed to create and not to fill the time honored "long felt want," for in its conception we made an exhaustive investigation of the locality where its accouchement in the newspaper family would create the least commotion, and Washington was selected, as offering the ideal spot for its birth and bringing up.

The Sunday Morning Globe has an advantageous opening in the early morn of the week, its useful life; and, when the opportunities offered in the absolute indifference of its contemporaries to the rich fields and luxuriant pastures of life, sensational local happenings and soul satisfying news—of whited sepulchers, pious hypocrites and the Jekyle's and Hyde's of high and low society—are prudently as well as fearfully applied, the infancy of the Sunday Morning Globe will speedily develop into that phenomenal condition the envious dub "notoriety," by way of approach, but which the intelligent and the liberal more sagaciously name—success.

The Sunday Globe will not entrench upon the exclusive monopoly now enjoyed by its respected contemporaries of the news in foreign lands; they can minutely record, as heretofore, without infringement on the part of the Sunday Globe, all the happenings of Royalty, its deaths, marriages, births, and liaisons; as from their point of view it is more important that their readers should know when the Kaiser sneezed; when King Edward reformed, or when some princeling ran away with another man's wife than that official theft, disgusting vice and unabridged devilry of all kinds nearer home should be exposed, to the moral end that these evils may be corrected.

The Sunday Globe will give precedence to an item from Foggy Bottom over one from the Palace of St. James; and it will Greco-Romanize the high Jenks on Connecticut avenue in preference to the latest Cleveland street scandal of the London aristocracy.

The Sunday Morning Globe will be a Washington local newspaper, full of the latest, live sensations of the greatest Capital, of the greatest Nation, and of the most consistent and persistent sinners of any people on the face of the earth!

The Sunday Globe will be a straight out Democratic newspaper, as in Democracy alone is the hope of this Nation. For over forty years, except a brief interval which, perhaps, was not wisely nor judiciously utilized, the Republican party has wielded the destinies of this Republic—a Republic now in name only. Of these four decades of unparalleled profligacy, corruption, plunder, and official rapacity the last has had crowded into it not only all the crimes and vices of the thirty years preceding, but its end has witnessed the practical dissolution of Republican institutions though in theory they still exist.

Trusts and monopolies have been fostered and encouraged until they now dictate the legislation of the country and select the legislators, both State and National. Their representatives in the Presidential chair, in the Attorney General's office and in the other Executive Departments are but guided automatons.

Hence, the practical alliance with the "Robber Nation" England; hence the war upon a friendly people struggling for the land of their fathers, in the far off distant Philippines; hence the brutal dominating ownership of Cuba, thereby knowingly and premeditatedly endeavoring to force the people into armed opposition, to the end that the last vestige of independence may be taken from them; and, hence the increase of the army, for foreign as well as domestic conquest—as assuredly the fifth decade of the Mammon rule under which the people are being robbed of not only their substance but of their liberties—will not end without the culmination of that crisis predicted by the wisest and the best of our statesmen. What then?

It is to add our feeble help to the general effort being put forth, to reclaim without bloodshed, the heritage of the fathers and bring back the ship of state to that sure and safe anchorage for which Lincoln shed his blood, Jackson fought with pen and sword, Jefferson conceived and Washington bravely

achieved, that the Sunday Globe allies itself with the incorruptible Democratic press, party and people.

That a fair and comprehensive understanding may at once be established between the Sunday Globe and its future patrons—the general public—its editor deems it proper to state that he has had experience in the profession of journalism. This experience has led him almost to the foot of the scaffold.

The pen which could not be intimidated by the shadow of the gallows or immurement in a dungeon and which no personal consideration of safety or profit could induce him to prostitute, will not be easily silenced by the bludgeon of the ruffian or the more refined methods of the legal pirate.

In defense of the principles embraced in this salutatory and in advocacy of the rights of the masses the editor of the Sunday Globe earned the hostility of privileged and domineering patriots, who sought his destruction, but as "Truth crushed to earth will rise again," so he whose pen it was sought to stifle, whose life was legally threatened and whose liberty was violated now re-dedicates pen and brain, life and liberty to the cause of the robbed and plundered people, and to the only political party in which peace, patriotism and the perpetuity of a redeemed, re-habilitated and free Republic can be found.

W. J. ELLIOTT.

Democratic Principles.

In the cardinal principles of the Democratic party Bryan and Cleveland, David B. Hill and Carter Harrison and six or seven millions of their fellow Democrats believe Democracy, as contra-distinct from Republicanism, is the teaching of Jefferson as against the theory and convictions of Hamilton.

Responsible for the two great modern parties, Jefferson and Hamilton, respectively stood the one for strong government, the other for strong people.

The central idea was Hamilton's, with its developing train of colonial exploitations and imperialistic possibilities; power in the people with a government under control and responsible to the masses was and still is the Jeffersonian or Democratic ideal of a republican form of government.

Any internal differences existing in either one of the two great parties is due to the application of these respective basic principles, and not to modification or abandonment of the principles themselves.

There is no unprejudiced student of history who will gainsay the assertion that if the principles of Hamilton had prevailed, this republic would have arrived at its present milestone on the road to an imperial form of government more than half a century ago, and to day we would be in the aristocratic enjoyment of a full-fledged monarchy, following the customary progressiveness of political creations.

The Jeffersonian idea took hold of the people, and its judicious dissemination, nurture, and beneficence destroyed imperialism and strong-government Hamiltonism, but left the germ which modern plutocracy and class aspiration have, in our day, warmed into life and giant growth, until the monster now has the republic by the throat, and the ideals of Jefferson and Jackson are but the discarded idols whose worship is confined to an innumerable minority among the leaders and to the thoughtful and unpurchasable among the masses.

The glib slave who, parrot-like, defends his voluntary serfdom by reciting the litany of his masters, is ever asking "what are the principles of the Democratic party?" utterly ignorant or ungratefully forgetful of the fact that to those principles he is indebted for the freedom which permits him to criticize government and parties.

The Democratic party advocates and believes in home rule and domestic tranquility as opposed to internal oppression and colonial conquest and spoliation.

It is a foe to the aggrandizement of government at the price of liberty; in other words, it would have its elected servants the instruments, and not the masters of the people, thereby insuring an administration of affairs in conformity to the theory and practice of democracy—a government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

The Democratic party advocates a government of intelligence as opposed to the plutocratic and monarchial principle of a government of exclusiveness and wealth; it would have the equality of general education the fundamental principle of a republic, as opposed to the perfection of a wealth-ruling class exercising the functions of irresponsible imperialism over an illiterate, disqualified, and ignorant mass.

Hence it enforces, where it can, the educational test for the exercise of the franchise, to the end that the degenerate may be rehabilitated, the ambitious and ignorant made intelligent reasoners of policies, and the soulless, indifferent slave of political sloth transformed into the mainly capability of enjoying the full blessings of a citizen and a peer.

It would furnish servants for government of freemen, and not satraps to rule self-constituted slaves.

It would hold public servants to full accountability, and oppose their defection as gods.

It reinforces, revivifies, encourages, and maintains the power of the people and the responsibilities of government to its creators as opposed to the assumption of superiority in the ruler and his responsibility alone to a privileged class.

It jealously prevents the strengthening of government where it weakens the power of the people as opposed to the Hamiltonian Federalist principle of a strong central government indestructible by the people, impervious to their assaults

and criticism, and irresponsible to their grievances and complaints.

The Democratic idea, in a nut shell, is strength in the home and manhood in the individual, as opposed to the sacrifice of local power and inherent right in exchange for general aggrandizement and ever-fading responsibility—our present unhappy and deplorable condition.

The principles of Democracy are the natural aspirations of mankind; the precepts and practices of Republicanism are the artificial creations of inordinate ambition, wealth, and cultivated exclusiveness.

The former encourages the growth of individual strength, quickens the budding consciousness of power in self and dependence to us of our creations. Thus government is the creature, and leans on its creator; it exists at our bidding, and is changed, modified, and endowed to respond to the desideratum of conferring the greatest good on the greatest number by the will alone of its creators—the people, through their delegated servants.

This is Democratic doctrine—the basic principles of a republican form of government. How does the present kingly powers conferred on or assumed by the chief servant of the state correspond to this comprehensive and plain declaration of Democratic principles?

The plutocracy of the nation is in the saddle, and its servants—the people's masters—are everywhere our flag floats exercising the functions of irresponsible satraps in legislating and administering the affairs of the republic for the exclusive benefit of a privileged class.

The voice of the people is only heard in slavish pleas of rejoicements over the conquest, spoliation, and humiliation of peoples struggling for liberty and self-government, while at home the indignant protests of democratic millions are unheeded or drowned in the noise of McKinley war drums and Hanna Morgan-Rockefeller celebrations over the combinations of gigantic trusts, whose united wealth astounds the civilized world and absolutely controls the destinies of the republic.

This Republic and the Boers.

If there is nothing else chargeable to the McKinley administration but the cold indifference with which it has witnessed the wiping out of two republics and the destruction of a brave and God-fearing people, it is sufficient in material for the most infamous chapter of our history.

Analogy never had and never can have a more striking similitude than the Colonial war, and the immortal conflict waged by the gallant Dutch burghers of the Transvaal and Orange Free State. The same issues were at stake in both wars, and the same cry—England—was contended against. The chivalrous French nation forced its monarch and aristocracy to aid in our stupendous struggle, and principally to the assistance given, on land and sea, in ships, arms, money, and men the Republic of the United States successfully established.

Nor can the Anglo-Saxon diplomat at either side of the Atlantic neglect an iota from the priceless service rendered the Colonies by France with the disingenuous assertion that this service was given more through hatred of England than love for the Colonists.

The impartial historian, however, of the McKinley administration will be forced to record a much more damning apology, and one which the facts themselves leave no room for qualification, in the matter of its attitude towards the Anglo-Dutch war in South Africa. He will be compelled to write, in substance this sentence:

"The Republican administration of William McKinley aided and abetted the Tory government of Lord Salisbury in the destruction of the two Dutch republics, not because of any special antipathy or hatred of the Burghers, but because of the love of the American administration for England."

This sentence will be expanded and amplified by the apologetic historian into an exhaustive summary of our alleged obligations to England in the Spanish-American war, and our gratitude and love resultant therefrom, which culminated in giving England a free hand in Africa and selling her supplies of war material, horses, mules, bread stuffs and permitting thousands of degenerate Americans to ship on cattle boats, ostensibly as non-combatant employees, but who on landing at Cape Town, immediately enlisted in the British military service to fight the Boers!

What a spectacle this once liberty-loving republic presents to the civilized world in this opening of the new century! For over one hundred years the hope, the refuge and the idol of the oppressed of the entire globe it has now become so poor in the cardinal virtues which distinguished it, that neither Cuban, Porto Rican nor Filipino will do it voluntary reverence, for it is absurd to accept as voluntary or loyal the present manipulated acquiescence and allegiance of the people of those islands to the United States.

The criminal consistency of the Administration in not staying the pirate arm of England in South Africa while engaged itself in wars of spoliation and conquest in the far-distant Philippines is cheerfully acknowledged, and credit therefor is herewith noted. That consistency is, nevertheless, an indelible stain on the fair escutcheon of the Republic and has marked the parting of the ways—the roads of honor and infamy—in the future destiny of this Republic. We are now committed to a career of colonial conquests and exploitations, the arbitrary rule of military satraps and pro consuls for the weaker peoples and countries over whom we plant our flag, and in every detail, scope and plan of the ancient

Roman Republic we are the base, degenerate and sub-servient imitator.

The liberty loving the world over, whose idol was the free Republic of the United States, whose sustenance under the oppressions of autocratic and monarchial tyranny and injustice was the hope that a home in the new world for themselves or their posterity was waiting the hour of their expatriation have seen this idol shattered. The cabins of the European peasantry are in darkness for the light that illumined them has been extinguished in the blood of heroes, and the great Republic to whom by universal consent was entrusted the torch has abetted and permitted the assassination of Free Government at home and abroad!

Better a grave in the Transvaal than citizenship in a plutocracy!

And more preferable the rock of St. Helena, the dungeon of Cape Town or the fevered death of Ceylon than submission to tyrants.

The brave of every clime will sing the requiem of the heroic Dutch burghers whose last great stand for Liberty has electrified the world, but better this requiem for the dead who fell in defense of hearth and home than the croon of the coward for the living who wear the shackles of the slave.

We are invited to join in the pean of rejoicing at the expanding greatness, and the development as a world power of the republic of Washington; its richness, its grandeur, its magnificence and its resources are the marvel of the age, but we would rather be heir to the poverty, the desolation and the ruin which the ruthless hand of England has wrought in the land of the liberty-loving Boer, than the sick bed sycophant, the gold embroidered strap, or the cringing senatorial degenerate, who fawns or licks the alms giving hands of the Trust's exalted agent in the White House.

We "would sooner be a dog and bay the moon" than an American citizen who finds cause for rejoicements in the triumph of the aristocracy of England over the pure hearted, God-fearing and liberty loving Boer, or who sees the exaltation of his country in the friendship or alliance of the monarchial assassin of the Dutch republics.

"The consent of the governed," the shibboleth of Democracy, is now a heresy and they who raise their voices in emphasizing it as the basic principle of established and righteous government are stigmatized as Anarchists. He who was the secretary and biographer of the greatest of commoners, Abraham Lincoln, is now the ruling spirit of an American cabinet which will go down in history as slavishly pro-British in its foreign policy, and the subversive agent of home plutocracy and arrogant imperialism.

The Republic of the Fathers has passed away and the antique Roman Imperialistic substitute has been launched on its career of colonial expansion and domestic degradation. No longer the refuge of the oppressed, but the alley of the oppressor, the hopes and aspirations of the European immigrant and the native citizen are alike blasted, and the privilege of free government is pathetically manifested in the apathy, with which the masses of the people accept, if not endorse, the plutocratic revolution.

The shrouded Boer in his native veldt and well defended kopje sleeps by the hand of the monarchial assassin, while freedom chants the dirge of the brave defender of altar and of fire-side.

Monarchist, aristocrat, plutocrat and expansionist in the unholy alliance of successful assassination triumphantly dictate conditions of "life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness" for the people, and behold how these inalienable rights are enjoyed where the flags of England and America wave above conquered province and betrayed commonwealth!

The surviving burghers, whose valor in the field and deathless love of freedom have won the admiration of all in whose breasts the divine spark of liberty is not yet extinguished, are assured of the fraternal fellowship of millions of Americans yet uncorrupted by the spoils of conquest; undazzled by the showy splendors of imperialistic trappings and unimpaired by the glare of bayonets which surround, with the other accessories of kingly pomp and magnificence the rulers of a stunned and bewildered nation, who were until the rise and successful revolution of plutocracy the simple "servants" of a free people.

To the glorious dead of Transvaal and Free State these millions of American born freemen, with reverential spirit, bow their heads in salutation of the brave.

The Trades Unionist of this city kindly noticed The Sunday Globe thusly:

"In answer to numerous inquiries I would state that the management of The Sunday Globe, mentioned in this column last week, as making its bow to a Washington public on May 5th, will be in the hands of William J. Elliott, a veteran publisher of Columbus, Ohio, whose success with the Capital, of that city, and the Citizen, of Cincinnati, is familiar to the newspaper fraternity. In Ohio Mr. Elliott and his associates were in hearty accord with organized labor, and it is needless to say that the Washington publication will carry the union label."

Our contemporary can rely on The Sunday Globe as a faithful ally in advocacy of the principles of organized labor. To use a homely proverb, "You can't teach an old dog new tricks," and having championed the cause for a third of a century we must continue to the end a pliant by choice, a Democrat by conviction and a trade unionist by inheritance.

Department Chiefs.

The bureaucratic "Egos," whose inflated imaginations and autocratic powers led them to assume the royal prerogative of England's King in their official signatures, have had a partial call down. At least the chief clerk of the War Department, "Schofield," as he was wont to affix his signature to public documents, was brought up with a round turn and compelled to attach his full name.

It is alleged that the Secretary in issuing the order was moved by envy or chagrin, inasmuch as owing to the suggestiveness of his cognomen he could not attach the euphonious name of "Root." That Elihu softens the suggestiveness of Root, is a matter of opinion. However, Mr. Schofield has had, and very properly, his ambition sternly rebuked, and "Edward Rex" can now enjoy the monopoly to himself.

Burns must have had the Washington Departmental chiefs in his mind's eye when he penned the oft-quoted lines:

O, would some power the gift to give us
To see ourselves as others see us.

The absolute powers assumed by these professional tax eaters and their cool airs of superiority can be likened only to the mythical hotel clerk, the paragraphers were wont to indent the funny columns of their papers with.

The "nerve" a bureau chief exhibits in posing as something other than the persistent and professional office-hunting creature that he is, would be amusing were it not disgustingly offensive, by reason of the unbridled license unwisely allowed him to dominate over and oppress the gentlemen whose necessities compelled them to serve the government in a clerical or humbler capacity. The public at large can hardly imagine the lordly isolation of a bureau chief during office hours. The frigidity of the atmosphere in his immediate vicinity discounts the coldness of a dog's nose or a North American seal. It freezes the genial currents in the awe-struck clerks, who invariably or intermittently suspend their breathing from time to time, to prevent a fog.

Nobody of less dignity than a United States Senator and of less virtue than a handsome female clerk, dare approach the chief with a bearing less deferential than a coolie Chinaman towards a red-buttoned Mandarin or a South African Hottentot. Kow towing before the rampant illustration in a book beer sign.

The Ramessis expression in the eyes and features of a department chief are alone known to the insubordinate clerk who has had the tenacity to meet his gaze while writhing under sarcasm as refined and keen as the leading "jeddys" in a living picture show; but his most dangerous mood is when in his Robinson Crusoe solitude of voiceless scorn, he annihilates with a look every living thing—with the exceptions heretofore noted!

The obsequiousness of the sycophant is another side of this picture of a tin god on wheels. No subordinate clerk who ever carried favor by tale bearing and cringing to his chief can equal that symbolical type of demi-god in the presence of the appointing power that made him. Here this jungle lion becomes a whining jackal, this "Tyrant of Syracuse" a fawning helot and his imperious bearing shrinks and dwindles into the most diminutive proportions—his whole tot ensemble, is apologetically, pathetic for being alive! He purrs where he roared, he smiles slavishly where he frowned threateningly and his suavity, acquiescence and subservience discounts the shadowy and skulking figure of a Parisian vander of obscene pictures.

We know the animal in all his moods and tenses, for we have had the singular experience of being his subordinate and his master, or at least his co-creator, as it takes the several orders of the higher powers to manufacture a typical department chief.

We have spurned his fawning as we have defied his threatening poses; measuring both by the standard of an American manhood and citizenship, to which he is a stranger and foe, and on which he is a libel when he assumes the role of the one or the other. While we do not proclaim it to be our special mission to effect the absolute reformation in this as in the other abuses which time has almost legitimized and occasional flashes of resentment have alone saved from solemn sanctification, we do propose and promise to thoroughly groom and thrash out the flagrant and conspicuous exhibitions of bureaucratic insolence and swelled head among the high salaried public servants, who take advantage of or utilize their little "brief authority" to oppress or maltreat their fellows, holding minor or subordinate positions.

Hearst on Democracy.

Mr. W. R. Hearst, in his newspaper, the New York Journal, has formulated a platform for the Democratic party which must meet with the hearty approval of every genuine Democrat. He wants live issues for dead or defeated ones, and like all men accustomed to individual success he is irritated and discontented at collective defeat. Mr. Hearst points the way to success for his party, and as he has demonstrated in his own career the elemental possession of the quantities necessary to achieve success he is entitled to respectful consideration, especially at the hands of those who have been unfortunate enough to have led the party to successive defeats. No Democrat can doubt Mr. Hearst's sincerity and that he deserves well of the Nation's Democracy for his stupendous efforts in behalf of the National ticket last fall, all will agree.

His platform is subjoined with the

amendment, which we respectfully offer as more fully covering his "second and third propositions":

"First, Election of Senators by the People—The Senate, now becoming the private property of corporations and bosses, to be made truly representative, and the State Legislatures to be reformed from recurring scandals.

"Second, Destruction of Criminal Trusts—No monopolization of the National resources by lawless private combinations more powerful than the people's Government.

"Third, No Protection for Oppressive Trusts—Organizations powerful enough to oppress the people are no longer 'infant industries'.

"Fourth, Public Ownership of Public Franchises—The values created by the community should belong to the community.

"Fifth, A Graduated Income Tax—Every citizen to contribute to the support of the Government according to his means, and not according to his necessities.

"Sixth, Currency Reform—All the Nation's money to be issued by the Nation's Government and its supply to be regulated by the people and not by the banks.

"Seventh, National, State and Municipal Improvement of the Public School System—As the duties of citizenship are both general and local, every government, general and local, should do its share toward fitting every individual to perform them."

The Sunday Globe's amendment:

Eighth, The Creation of an Industrial Department, Whose Head Shall Be a Member of the Cabinet—In this department the labor interests of the country shall be safe—guarded from the assaults of criminal capitalistic combinations, such as trusts, blacklisting and other hostile plutocratic attempts to degrade the toiler and prevent his natural development as a citizen and peer.

What Constitutes a Conquest?

Commenting on the war in South Africa the Manchester (Eng.) Guardian says:

"We acquired Ireland by the title of conquest unqualified by Irish consent, and accordingly we have now the Ireland, morally foreign, a weak and discredited, and a danger. Great powers partition Poland by right of simple force, thinking that a fraction of it will be as agreeable and as safe a possession as any original province in their own, and the result is that Poland, that everybody sees now, a Poland growing more distinctly and unanimously and resolutely Polish than ever. No power that has swallowed a piece of Poland has ever really digested it. Yet with Ireland and Poland and a score of similar cases before her eyes Germany proceeds, full of hope and complacency, to take Alsace and Lorraine for her own use, with the result that she has been compelled ever since to shape her foreign and even her home policy with an anxious eye to the dangers brought upon her by that foolish crime. Finally, our own imperialists come upon the stage and, with such an indifference to all the teaching of human history as could have been exemplified in the Garden of Eden, proceed rapturously to light one more fire to burn their own fingers with."

It has always been recognized that the consent or acknowledgement of the "conquered" was necessary to complete the "conquest." We challenge the "Guardian" as well as history to produce any treaty or compact whereby Ireland acknowledged its conquest or formally surrendered its God given right of autonomy as a distinct and independent nation. Nor has Ireland acquiesced by voice or act through any of her representatives in this so-called conquest. On the contrary, for seven centuries she has protested with voice, pen and sword against her oppressor, and so long as the green mounds entombed the ashes of martyr and fallen patriot sanctifies her soil she will assert her Nationality and struggle to achieve the dignity of an independent nation. Her sister Niobe, brave, unfortunate Poland, whom Bonaparte betrayed, and Prussian, Austrian and Russian dismembered, is ideally as much a nation as England. While the ideal lives in the breasts of the descendants of Kosciuszko and of Emmet, neither soldier nor statesman can destroy the nationality of the one or the other. Geographically they may be wiped from the map as in the case of Poland, or painted a British province as in the case of Ireland, but the song, the story and the heroism of Poland and Irishman emphasize and insure the immortality of their gallant nations.

The Ciceronian philippics of that constitutionally dyspeptic and dangerously venerable demagogue, "Charley Grovesnor," litter the Congressional Record, and seep through its pages from title page to final. His deceptive smile is encountered with equanimity by those only who know his cultivated treachery. Napoleon III never had a more conscienceless ally in overthrowing the French Republic in the Due de Morny than McKinley has in the Athenian politician. Will history repeat itself?

The military satraps and pro-consuls of the United States are but naturally following the methods of their kind, time immemorial, in arresting editors and suppressing hostile newspapers. The arrogant gaze of this man Wood in Cuba is exasperating, not only to Cubans but to Americans everywhere; he has tipped off the Presidential hand, as it were, and exposed the plastic material of McKinley favorites, ready "to scuttle the ship or cut a throat" at the drop of a hat.

Pool selling on the Bennis race track and villainous bucket shops hoveycombing the city are not as demoralizing as a quiet game of poker among gentlemen in a club room or private house. The latter is held to be gambling while the former is but simple highway robbery, with little or no chance for the victim. Police!

The aroma of the honeymoon in the show places of Washington salute the olfactory nerves and the torches of Hymen makes night luminous for the visiting couples.

If Irish agitators are justified in appealing to the justice of mankind against "the hereditary enemy, England," because less than twenty men own the soil of England, what chunks of sympathy are Americans not entitled to, whose lives, fortunes and sacred honor are owed in fee simple by Messrs. Morgan, Rockefeller, Hill, Stillman, Dill, Harriman and Hanna—seven in all? We pause for a reply. (Cheers.)

THE EQUALITY OF MANY.

The Post denies that "all men are created free and equal, the Declaration of Independence to the contrary, notwithstanding, and proceeds to logically refute the assertion by demonstrating that no two men are endowed equally alike by nature. Scarcely are fifteen in one particular and some in another barbarian, Indian, and Caucasian, etc. What has all this to do with the fact itself 'that all men are born or created free and equal?' Are they not? Are not all men the sons of Adam, and are they not the creations of the same God? If governments and society, environments and hereditary or acquired endowments separate them into classes after birth, how does this fact disprove the fundamental principle—the equal creation? Are they not products of nature as like in kind and servant, and in exchange of children is made at birth between a civilized Caucasian and a savage, will not each grow up in his respective sphere a typical representative of the people and the society who raise him? Does not this fact prove the contention of the Declaration, that at birth, at least, as in death, men are created equal and destined to the same equality—the grave.

The Post is at fault in its inductive reasoning, and Bacon, the father of the science, would likewise fail to establish the contention that because some men are rich, some intellectual, and some physically perfect, therefore all men are not CREATED free and equal.

The equality defined by the Declaration is not equality of fortune, or the equality of physical or mental endowments, and the Post is purposely obtuse in deducting such an inference upon which to predicate its argument.

The equality to live and die, is established *post mortem*, as all men live and all men die. The equality to live, however, without interference from, or the oppression of the rich, the powerful, the unscrupulous and the tyrannical, is the inalienable right of the lowliest being, created in the image and likeness of the God of all. Justice, therefore, in his teachings and death typified this inalienable right or principle. It is because of the violation of this right or principle that men do not live as they were created—free and equal.

In one period the physically superior invaded and crushed the physically inferior, hence the creative equality was destroyed—that is, the right of the inferior to the equality of living and enjoying the earth, and the fullness thereof.

In a succeeding age the intellectually superior became the aggressor and invaded likewise the right of the inferior to the creative equality conferred by birth, and to-day this materialistic superiority, tempered with hypocrisy, cunning, and a disbelief in Genesis, invade and crush their inferior and equally created fellow man.

The Post will observe that it does not establish its assumed proposition of the inequality of creative mental and physical endowments, but that in his development into manhood the physically or mentally superior man—oppresses or deprives his inferior or unsuccessful fellow of his creative right—to the earth and the fullness thereof.

And why should an intellectually and physically deficient man be classed as inferior, when the spirituality of all men is the gift of the grace of God? And when the probability exists that the inferior physical and mental endowment is endowed with superior spiritual graces? If we concede the immortality of the soul we must acknowledge the creative equality of man if we deny the soul, and it is because the existence of the soul is denied or disbelieved in that the materialistic point of view of our esteemed contemporary is tenable in its declaration of the inequality of man. Then the annual religion of survival of the fittest takes the place of the immortal doctrine of the Nazarene, and Paganism with its gods debases the Holy Trinity.

The Declaration of Independence asserting that "all men are created free and equal," forcibly and clearly epitomizes the ten commandments, and simply declares the purpose, design, and work of the Almighty—it is the essence of Christianity. Modifications or denials are alike Pagan, and of human inspiration, desire and accomplishment.

The trouble with our able and esteemed local contemporaries in discussing the Philippine question is that to cloak the attempted conquest of those islands by this so-called Republic they raise the issue of Aquinaldo's personality. This is the old and time-honored method of "kicking up a dust to cover the real movement." If Aquinaldo never existed or his colleagues or people what difference would such a contingency make in the principle at stake? Would it not be establishing colonies and a departure from the safe as well as the traditional policy of this country? The acquisition of distant and foreign countries, their settlement, development and government is not only experimentally dangerous to our own peace and internal as well as external policies but, as stated, in direct conflict with the declaratory principles upon which the free Republic of the United States was founded and established. Contiguous territory and not foreign possessions, either with the consent or opposition of the governed, has been the allowable and natural policy of this country and of a free people; under this policy we have not only grown great and prosperous as a nation, but maintained the respect and the sympathy of the liberty loving the world over. Where are the advantages in the change, even if we are degenerate enough to ignore the principles upon which our Government was established? The anomaly of professing Democratic newspapers advocating the retention of foreign conquests and supporting imperialistic schemes strikes us as shining illustrations of this degeneracy.

If Irish agitators are justified in appealing to the justice of mankind against "the hereditary enemy, England," because less than twenty men own the soil of England, what chunks of sympathy are Americans not entitled to, whose lives, fortunes and sacred honor are owed in fee simple by Messrs. Morgan, Rockefeller, Hill, Stillman, Dill, Harriman and Hanna—seven in all? We pause for a reply. (Cheers.)